SECTION 9 — CONCLUSION

Proposed False Claims Act Disclosure

This investigation began with a simple observation: an unidentified aerial object repeatedly appeared in the sky near my home. I did not begin this investigation with an interest in unidentified aerial phenomena, nor did I originally intend to prepare a report for Congress. I began by observing, photographing, recording, testing, and documenting what was occurring.

Over time, the scope of those observations expanded considerably.

The resulting record documents persistent stationary observations, recurring mobile objects, extensive aircraft and drone activity, environmental conditions occurring contemporaneously with that activity, observations made during interstate travel, events occurring after public disclosures, and a substantial body of photographs, videos, handwritten logs, metadata, environmental measurements, aviation information, and other supporting records.

This report does not claim to have determined what the unidentified objects are. It does not establish who operates them, whether every category of activity documented herein is related, or whether every unusual event occurring during the investigation shares a common explanation.

Those questions remain unresolved.

What this investigation does establish is that a substantial contemporaneous record exists and that many of the remaining questions cannot be answered using information available to a private citizen.

9.1 Governmental Awareness

One of the central unresolved questions is whether relevant governmental entities were aware of the aerial activity documented in this report and, separately, whether they became aware of my investigation and public reporting.

Those are not the same question.

The available evidence does not permit me to determine whether relevant federal entities were:

- Unaware of both the documented aerial activity and my reporting;
- Aware of the aerial activity but unaware of my reporting;
- Aware of my reporting but unable to correlate it with information already possessed by other governmental components;
- Aware of both the activity and my reporting; or
- Operating with different information distributed among different agencies, commands, contractors, or governmental components without that information being fully correlated.

Each possibility presents materially different oversight questions.

If relevant agencies were unaware of persistent unidentified aerial activity occurring alongside the extensive aerial operations documented herein, Congress may reasonably

inquire whether existing detection, reporting, and information-sharing systems functioned as intended.

If relevant agencies were aware of the underlying activity but unaware that a civilian was publicly documenting it over an extended period, the question becomes whether civilian reporting concerning potentially relevant observations can effectively reach the governmental entities responsible for evaluating them.

If relevant agencies were aware of both, Congress can determine what evaluation occurred, what records were generated, whether my evidence was reviewed or sought, and what actions, if any, followed.

These questions cannot be resolved from the civilian side of the evidentiary record.

9.2 If the Objects Were Not United States Assets

Nothing in this report establishes that the unidentified objects were operated by the United States military or any other governmental entity. The presence of observations within an area of substantial military activity does not, by itself, establish governmental ownership.

However, excluding United States ownership does not resolve the underlying question.

It creates another one.

If the objects documented in this report were not United States assets, investigators should determine whether they were detected and, if so, whether they were identified as foreign, domestic, private, commercial, experimental, anomalous, or otherwise explainable.

If they were detected but remained unidentified, investigators should determine what reporting, investigation, or response followed.

If they were not detected, despite their reported persistence and proximity to other aerial activity, that raises a separate question concerning airspace awareness and detection capabilities.

The issue therefore does not end with determining that an object was "not ours." Determining what was operating in the relevant airspace, whether it was detected, and what governmental systems recorded remains an appropriate subject for independent investigation.

9.3 Civilian Safety and Duty-to-Warn Questions

The investigation also raises questions concerning what, if anything, relevant governmental entities understood about the potential risks associated with the documented phenomena.

Intelligence Community Directive 191 establishes a duty-to-warn framework under specified circumstances involving intelligence concerning threats of intentional killing, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping. This report does not conclude that ICD 191 applied to the circumstances documented herein, nor does it assert that the directive creates a privately enforceable right.

Instead, the existence of governmental warning and civilian-protection frameworks raises a broader oversight question:

If relevant governmental entities were aware of the phenomenon and aware of repeated civilian exposure to it, what assessment was made concerning the potential risk to those civilians?

If the phenomenon was believed to present a danger, Congress should determine what warning, mitigation, investigation, or other protective measures were considered and whether existing policies were followed.

If it was believed not to present a danger, investigators should determine what information supported that assessment.

If its potential danger was unknown, Congress should determine what procedures govern prolonged civilian exposure to an unidentified phenomenon whose risks have not been established.

The absence of a warning, standing alone, does not establish governmental knowledge or misconduct. But if governmental awareness is independently established, the absence of warning or civilian engagement becomes relevant to determining what was known about the potential risk and what responsibilities followed from that knowledge.

9.4 Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and Sensitive Airspace

The observations documented during the April 2026 trip to the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area make these questions particularly important.

This report documents observations in the vicinity of Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport and other highly sensitive areas of the National Capital Region. Ordinary aviation continued during portions of the documented activity.

If independent governmental records corroborate the presence of unidentified aerial activity during the periods identified in the chronology, investigators should determine whether the activity was detected, identified, assessed, authorized, investigated, or otherwise known to the entities responsible for aviation safety and national security.

The appropriate question is not simply whether an unidentified phenomenon constitutes a national-security threat.

The questions include:

Was it considered a threat? Was it considered a safety hazard? Was it considered known and non-threatening activity? Was its risk unknown? Or was it genuinely not detected?

Each answer carries substantially different implications.

9.5 Collection of Information Concerning the Author

The events documented in the Retaliatory or Responsive Events section do not independently establish governmental surveillance, monitoring, retaliation, or coordination. I recognize that much of this evidence is circumstantial and that individual events may have unrelated or ordinary explanations.

Nevertheless, the aggregate chronology raises questions appropriate for independent investigation.

If governmental records establish that information concerning me, my family, my movements, my communications, or my investigative activities was collected, retained,

disseminated, or acted upon, Congress should determine what authority governed that activity, what factual or operational predicate supported it, what limitations applied, which governmental components received the information, and for what purpose it was used.

That question is distinct from whether the underlying aerial phenomena were governmental.

Likewise, if governmental personnel were sufficiently aware of my activities to monitor or track them, investigators should determine whether those same entities were aware that I possessed a substantial body of evidence concerning the phenomenon and why that evidence was or was not sought.

9.6 The Uncollected Witness Evidence Problem

Throughout this investigation, I publicly stated that I possessed photographs, videos, contemporaneous logs, original metadata, environmental records, and other documentation concerning recurring unidentified aerial observations.

I ultimately identified myself publicly as conducting a whistleblower investigation and made increasingly direct attempts to bring the observations to governmental and congressional attention.

Yet no governmental entity approached me during the reporting period to obtain the complete evidentiary archive described in this report.

If relevant entities genuinely had no knowledge of either the observations or my reporting, that fact presents one information-flow problem.

If relevant entities knew about the observations but never became aware of the civilian evidence, that presents another.

If relevant entities knew about both but elected not to obtain the evidence, Congress may reasonably ask why.

The issue is not whether the government was obligated to accept my interpretation of what I observed. It is whether potentially relevant witness evidence concerning persistent unidentified aerial activity was appropriately collected, evaluated, preserved, or referred.

9.7 Retaliation and Responsive Events

This report does not present the documented responsive events as conclusive proof of retaliation.

Individually, several events have plausible alternative explanations. Collectively, their timing in relation to public disclosures, announced travel, whistleblower activity, and evidence collection caused me to preserve them as potentially relevant circumstantial evidence.

The distinction matters.

Circumstantial evidence can identify questions requiring further investigation without independently answering those questions.

Governmental, corporate, telecommunications, hotel, platform, aviation, and other records may be capable of establishing whether particular events were unrelated coincidences, ordinary technical or administrative occurrences, or components of a broader response.

I do not possess subpoena power and therefore cannot resolve those questions myself.

9.8 Questions for Congressional Review

Accordingly, I respectfully submit that the evidence preserved in this report warrants examination of several fundamental questions:

- What were the unidentified objects documented during the reporting period?
- Were they detected by governmental radar, surveillance, aviation, intelligence, or defense systems?
- If detected, how were they classified and what records were generated?
- If they were not United States assets, was their operator or origin identified?
- If they remained unidentified, what investigation or reporting followed?
- Which governmental entities, if any, became aware of my observations or public disclosures, and when?
- Was information concerning me or my investigation collected or disseminated? If so, under what authority and for what purpose?
- Was any assessment made concerning possible civilian exposure or safety?
- If no warning or intervention was considered necessary, what information supported that determination?
- Were my photographs, videos, logs, metadata, or other evidence ever evaluated by a governmental entity?
- If relevant entities knew such evidence existed but did not seek it, why?
- Did information concerning these events move between military, intelligence, aviation, law-enforcement, environmental, or other governmental components?
- Were applicable UAP reporting requirements and congressional notification requirements followed?
- Do contemporaneous governmental records corroborate, contradict, or otherwise explain the chronology presented in this report?

These questions do not presume their answers. They identify information that a private citizen cannot obtain but that appropriate congressional oversight may be capable of examining.

9.9 Final Statement

There are additional personal experiences associated with this investigation that I have deliberately excluded from its evidentiary findings. Some are subjective, some concern perceived communications or spiritual experiences, and some cannot presently be independently corroborated. They remain part of my personal account and are available for discussion if investigators consider them relevant, but they have not been offered as proof of the factual findings contained herein.

That distinction has been deliberate throughout this report.

I have attempted to document what I could document, preserve what I could preserve, identify what I could independently verify, and clearly label what I could not.

I cannot determine from my position whether the events documented herein represent known governmental activity, unidentified non-governmental activity, multiple unrelated phenomena, ordinary events occurring in unusual combinations, or something not adequately explained by the information presently available to me.

I also cannot determine what relevant governmental entities knew, when they knew it, or what actions they took based upon that knowledge.

Those are no longer questions that I can answer through additional observation from my window.

The evidence necessary to resolve many of them—radar records, operational records, flight logs, sensor data, communications, reporting records, investigative files, and other governmental documentation—exists, if it exists at all, on the other side of an information barrier that a private citizen cannot compel.

I have taken this investigation as far as my access, equipment, authority, and evidence permit.

The remaining questions belong to those with the authority to obtain the records capable of answering them.

9.10 Open Invitation for Independent Verification

The primary limitation of traditional civilian reporting is the reliance on historical accounts of events that cannot be independently evaluated after the fact. That constraint does not apply to this record.

The phenomenon documented herein is ongoing. At the time of this filing, persistent activity remains observable from North Carolina. Specifically, an object continues to occupy a recurring position in the western sky during the evening sunset window.

I extend a direct invitation to congressional investigators, scientific researchers, aviation safety officials, and accredited journalists to conduct direct, independent field observations from this location. Interested parties are encouraged to verify these observations using their own optical equipment, atmospheric sensors, radio monitoring gear, and high-resolution imaging systems.

The evidentiary archive compiled in this report stands on its own, but the definitive test of any observational record is real-time replication. Come and see.